

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 269 353

SP 027 336

AUTHOR Schumacher, Sally
TITLE Evaluation in a Collaborative Teacher Education Program: Formative Results and Summative Plans.
PUB DATE Feb 86
NOTE 10p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (Atlanta, GA, February 22-26, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Cooperation; *Educational Research; Higher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Workshops

ABSTRACT

Evaluation in a collaborative teacher education program presents challenges which can lead to institutional and programmatic changes. During 1984-85, formative and summative evaluation designs were developed by a committee of school/university participants. This paper summarizes the findings of formative data collected in four studies on: (1) collaborative organizational processes; (2) assessment of a workshop/seminar series; (3) characteristics of preservice teachers; and (4) generic objectives for the Collaborative Preservice Teacher Education Program. The summative design to be implemented in 1986-87 is also described, and the implications of these studies for continuing program development, accreditation, state department approval, teacher certification, and the model of a collaborative teacher education program are suggested. (CB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED269353

EVALUATION IN A COLLABORATIVE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM:
FORMATIVE RESULTS AND SUMMATIVE PLANS

Sally Schumacher, Ph. D.
Virginia Commonwealth University
School of Education

A paper presented at the Association of Teacher Educators Annual
National Conference: Atlanta, GA: February 22-26, 1986.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Schumacher

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP027336

EVALUATION IN A COLLABORATIVE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM:
FORMATIVE RESULTS AND SUMMATIVE PLANS

Sally Schumacher
Virginia Commonwealth University

Evaluation in a collaborative teacher education program presents challenges which can lead to institutional and programmatic changes. Most models or approaches to evaluation address procedures from the view point of only one institution (Stufflebeam and Webster, 1980). Objectives-based evaluation, decision-oriented evaluation, and responsive evaluation assume that the program is administered by one institution and basically operates within that single institution. Preservice and inservice teacher education programs, however, operate in two institutions, universities and school systems (Lanier, 1983; Maeroff, 1983). Furthermore, evaluation of preservice and inservice teacher education program components touch on sensitive issues to both institutions: teacher effectiveness and teacher evaluation.

During 1984-1985 formative and summative evaluation designs were developed by a committee of school-university participants and chaired by the Evaluation Specialist. The planning of the evaluation design was conducted within the framework of the general principles for developing a design and for reporting the results as stated in S. Schumacher, Evaluation of CoTEEP field-testing of workshop-seminar series and principles for summative evaluation, 1984.

This paper summarizes the findings of formative data collected during 1984-1985 (S. Schumacher, K. Esham, and D. Bauer, 1985). The results of each of the four studies were presented orally with a written executive summary to the appropriate audiences: CoTEEP Planning Committee, Richmond City Public Schools Planning Retreat, School of Education faculty, and the Interim Report submitted to NCATE. This paper also notes the summative design to be implemented in 1986-1987. The implications of these studies for continuing program development, NCATE accreditation, state department program approval, teacher certification, and the model of a collaborative teacher education program are suggested.

SUMMARY OF FORMATIVE STUDIES

The four formative studies conducted in 1984-1985 were: 1) description of collaborative planning and development processes, 2) assessment of the collaborative workshop-seminar series (inservice training), 3) identification of preservice teacher characteristics, and 4) determination of collaborative generic objectives in professional knowledge and educational beliefs for preservice teachers.

The evaluation studies were collaboratively designed, especially those for the determination of preservice teacher characteristics and generic objectives for preservice teachers (Schumacher, 1985). The instruments used in both of these studies and for the participants' evaluation questionnaire for the workshop-seminar series were reviewed by the Evaluation Committee. Each instrument was revised several times. Two instruments were adaptations of those developed by Michigan State University: The VCU School of Education Entering Teacher Candidate Survey and the VCU Teacher Knowledge and Educational Beliefs Inventory. The questionnaire to evaluate the workshop-seminar series was a revision of the one used for Phase II: CoTEEP Questionnaire, EDU 651. The Consultant Interview Schedule was also a revision of the one used in Phase II.

Data on the workshop-seminar series were collected from 21 of the 24 inservice teachers and all five of the university consultants in May, 1985. Data on the characteristics of preservice teachers were collected from entering junior education majors in fall, 1984. The response rate for this study was 83% for the entire population, although for elementary majors, a subgroup, the response rate was 95%. Data to determine the generic objectives for preservice teachers were collected in early spring, 1985, from 28 university professors who taught courses in which elementary education majors enrolled during the two preceding years and from 36 school educators who participated in the collaborative program.

Data were collected for the description and analysis of the collaborative planning and implementation process by ethnography or participant-observation (Schumacher, 1979,1984). Data were primarily field notes of the Evaluation Specialist, documents, and in-depth interviews. Field notes were taken at meetings of the Evaluation Committee, the Planning Committee, and the

university consultants core. Several in-depth interviews were held with the Co-Directors, Dean of the School of Education, and the Director of Undergraduate Clinical Experiences. Documents of all minutes, notices, agendas, policy statements, program descriptions, and other information were data sources. The analysis was done by triangulation (Denzin, 1978) and cross-validation (House, 1977). The theoretical framework for the analysis is one of organizational change and change processes.

Inferential and descriptive statistics were used for data analyses in the studies. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze participant responses to the workshop-seminar series questionnaire. Chi-square and analysis of variance were used to compare the characteristics of elementary education majors to the other education majors. Multivariant profile analysis was used to compare school and university teacher educator responses to determine collaborative generic objectives for preservice teachers. Tests of significance in all analyses were conducted with .05 level of confidence.

Study 1. Collaborative organizational processes. The collaborative organizational processes expanded from planning in 1980-1983 to development, implementation and evaluation of more components of the innovative teacher education program in 1984-1985. Organizational processes were both between the university and school system and within each institution. The Planning Committee continued to meet monthly to reach consensus on difficult issues. Organizational processes leading to action were incremental with build-in feedback mechanisms. Collaboration occurred in developing program components, identifying the need for school site cores with specific functions, planning the evaluation design for the program, setting preservice teacher objectives, and in changed preservice teacher placement procedures. These new preservice teacher placement procedures were in response to expressed concerns of school systems and new state department of education guidelines. In addition, the university initiated a microcomputer record-keeping system to maintain centralized preservice teacher records and a macrocomputer WYLBUR file to maintain a data bank for formal evaluation of the preservice teacher education program.

Study 2. Assessment of the Workshop-Seminar Series. The workshop-seminar

series, "Trends in Teaching" was presented by five consultants, each with a similar format but a different topic. The series emphasized patterning and problem-solving as a new teaching trend in K-8 language arts, math, science, concept learning, and using the arts in basic skills. Teaching strategies were presented, demonstrated with children (videotaped by consultant), analyzed in the workshop, applied by each participant in their own classroom, and critiqued by the other participants and consultant.

The consultants felt the impact of the workshop varied among the teacher participants; however, the process provided teachers with a descriptive knowledge of the strategies and increased self-confidence with problem-solving instructional approaches. Because of the five week format, it was difficult for participants to obtain the necessary background information and skills to effectively use all problem-solving instructional strategies. All five consultants reported spill-over effects to the faculties within the six schools. The assessment of the workshop-seminar series by the inservice teachers was positive. Ninety-five percent of the teachers gained additional insights about the strategies, and over 60% felt more comfortable in supervising preservice teachers and working cooperatively with other teachers. Teachers were more willing to have a fellow teacher or a preservice teacher view their application of a strategy than a consultant.

Study 3. Characteristics of Preservice Teachers. An Entering Teacher Candidate Survey was administered to preservice education students enrolled in their first professional foundation courses, fall, 1984. The major finding was that, with few exceptions, preservice teachers are remarkably similar (cf Book, Byers, and Freeman, 1984, and Book, Freeman, and Brousseau, 1984). The career choice of classroom teaching is typically made after high school (60%) because of a desire to work with children and opportunity to apply the major field of study. Classroom teaching is viewed as a career ladder which is "good for a woman" with "lots of time off." Although a majority of the candidates expect to earn an advanced degree, they also plan to work as a teacher less than 10 years. Preservice candidates want to enter teaching immediately upon graduation and prefer to work in suburban public schools in Virginia.

Preservice candidates rate most highly knowledge acquired by experience or practical knowledge. Almost 80% rate experiences as a K-12 student as a "very

important source" of knowledge. This finding also relates to the "high confidence" or "complete confidence" preservice teachers express to successfully perform 15 different teaching roles "with no further course work or experience in education."

Preservice teachers believe the general goals of schooling include the promotion of intellectual growth and emotional growth (self-worth) rather than social reform. Preservice teachers hold remarkably similar educational beliefs, apparently acquired prior to entering a teacher preparation program. In other words, preservice teachers hold similar self-selected belief systems about students, the social context of schooling, curriculum, teachers, and teaching strategies.

Study 4. Generic objectives for the Collaborative Preservice Teacher Education Program. Data were collected from the School of Education faculty (university educators) and a sample of RPS participants (school educators) to determine generic professional knowledge and educational beliefs objectives for preservice teachers (TBKI survey). The major findings are summarized below.

a). The profiles of crucial professional knowledge objectives of the two groups of teacher educators differ significantly ($p=.055$). University educators consider knowledge about students, the social context of schooling and curriculum as crucial slightly more than do school educators. School educators consider knowledge about teachers and especially about teaching strategies as crucial more than do university educators.

b). The profiles of crucial educational belief objectives of the two groups of teacher educators are similar ($p=.505$). However, school educators tend to rate a higher percent of items as crucial uniformly across the five pedagogical topics of educational beliefs.

c). Both groups of teacher educators would have 68.5% of the belief statements emphasized in the program and only 16.2% of the belief statements for which students would develop their own position. However, not all these beliefs are crucial. University and school educators consider only 14.1% of the belief statements as crucial.

d). Depending upon the criterion used, both groups of teacher educators rate 15 statements (70% or more), 25 statements (60% or more), or 36 statements (50% or more) as crucial or very important knowledge objectives for preservice

teachers. Both teacher educator groups rate highly knowledge of the content and the discipline taught as a school subject, learning principles, and effective approaches to teacher decision-making in curriculum development and teaching strategies which promote student academic achievement (70% and 60% or more) and rate less highly theoretical knowledge about students (50% or more). A discrepancy index suggests that university educators rate more often general knowledge and reflective teacher thinking skills as crucial objectives and school educators rate more often particularistic knowledge about students and curriculum resources as crucial objectives.

e). Both groups of teacher educators agree that 14 statements are not important professional knowledge objectives for preservice teachers. Seven statements relate to the social context of schooling, two statements relate to curriculum, and the remaining five statements relate to the development of a career teacher. The study did not address whether this knowledge is crucial in the subsequent development of a professional teacher.

f). Depending upon the criterion used, both groups of teacher educators rate 2 statements (70% or more), 4 statements (60% or more), or 10 statements (50% or more) as crucial or very important belief objectives for preservice teachers. Both teacher educator groups rate highly beliefs that a teacher must be an enthusiastic, life-long learner and the necessity of continually testing and refining the assumptions and beliefs that guide one's approach to teaching, that student learning objectives should guide lesson planning, and that teachers should enforce rules for acceptable student behavior (70% and 60% or more). Both groups rate less highly (50% or more) beliefs about the importance of student responsibility and risk taking, educational equity as equal opportunity to learn, the value of intrinsic rewards in learning and systematic diagnosis of student needs.

g). A major finding is that both groups of teacher educators rate 36 (60%) of the 60 professional knowledge statements and only 10 (17.5%) of the 57 educational belief statements as crucial or very important. Thus, both educator groups consider a large number of knowledge statements and a relatively small number of belief statements as essential objectives for preservice teachers. Based on the results of this study, it appears that collaborative preservice teacher objectives would consist of primarily professional knowledge and few selected educational beliefs. Consensus exists

on the importance of applied knowledge. In addition, university educators would emphasize general or theoretical knowledge and school educators would emphasize practical (particularistic) knowledge.

PLANS FOR SUMMATIVE EVALUATION

The remaining components of the evaluation designed for 1986-1987 are: 1) survey of preservice teacher characteristics each semester; 2) assessment of inservice training in 1985-1986 and 1986-1987; 3) description of the collaborative processes with an emphasis on organizational change; 4) survey of graduating teacher candidates each semester beginning fall, 1985, including a pre-post design on selected characteristics; 5) assessment of classroom performance of student teachers, using a modification of the Georgia Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments by trained data collectors in addition to the school-university supervisors' assessments; and 6) NTE scores of graduating teacher candidates.

CONCLUSION

Each of the above organizational changes and the resulting studies has implications for evaluation models, NCATE accreditation, state program approval process (accountability), and teacher certification process (product credibility). A new evaluation model may be emerging in response to the collaborative nature of the teacher education program. The university is now systematically assessing preservice teachers (knowledge, beliefs, and classroom performance) prior to graduation. Furthermore, the utilization of a program evaluation design conducted by evaluators independent of the program should provide additional credibility for the university teacher education program and for its graduates in the state of Virginia.

The formal evaluation studies also have implications for developing a model of a collaborative teacher education program. Unlike prior studies conducted in Triple TTT projects, this evaluation effort documents the process of developing the collaborative model as it occurs. Factors such as the need for administrative commitment by the Superintendent of the school system and the Dean of the School of Education are essential. The organizational rhythms of each institution is taken into account in the planning and implementation of the multiple expanding program components. Interaction among key participant

groups and institutional administrators (stakeholders) to reach consensus on difficult issues occurs. Institutional resources of the school system and the university are used in addition to those allocated in the formal budget of the state department of education Pilot Studies Program and the matching funds by the school system and the university. Feedback mechanisms for the presentation of formal evaluation studies are sought and used. Changing school and university personnel and other personnel now touched by the developing program requires constant communication, role clarification, and priority setting. It is a slow, frustrating, time consuming, yet exciting process to bring about institutional change in a collaborative manner.

References

Book, C., Byers, J. and Freeman, D. (1983). Student expectations and teacher education traditions with which we can and cannot live. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(1), 9-13.

Book, C., Freeman, D., and Brousseau, B. (1984, April). Comparisons of the demographic characteristics and bases for career aspirations of education and non-education majors. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Denzin, N.K. (1978). The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods (2nd ed.). Chicago: Aldine.

House, E.R. (1977). The logic of evaluation argument. CSF Monograph Series in Evaluation. 7. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA Graduate School of Education.

Lanier, J. E. (1983). Tensions in teaching teachers the skills of pedagogy. In Griffin, G.A. (ed.), Staff development. 82nd Yearbook for the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Maeroff, G. I. (1983). School and college. Lawrenceville, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Schumacher, S. (1979). Ethnographic inquiry: Theory and application in educational research and evaluation. Richmond, VA: Virginia Commonwealth University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 184 108).

Schumacher, S. (1984). Evaluation of CoTEEP field-testing of workshop-seminar series and principles for summative evaluation, 1894. Richmond, VA: Virginia Commonwealth University, School of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 252 499).

Schumacher, S. (1985). The complexities of a collaborative teacher education program evaluation. Richmond, VA: Virginia Commonwealth University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 261 985).

Schumacher, S., Esham, K., and Bauer, D. (1985). Evaluation of a Collaborative Teacher Education Program: Planning, Development and Implementation, Phase III. Richmond, VA: Virginia Commonwealth University, School of Education. (mimeo).

Stufflebeam, D. L. and Webster, W. J. (1980). An analysis of alternative approaches to evaluation. Educational evaluation and policy analysis. 2(3), 5-20.